DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 236 289 UD 023 175

AUTHOR Garvey, Reba
TITLE Kindergarten Reinforcement. Disadvantaged Pupil Program Fund. Evaluation Report, 1982-1983.
INSTITUTION Cleveland Public Schools, OH. Dept. of Research and Analysis.
PUB DATE Jul 83
NOTE 20p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Basic Skills; *Cognitive Processes; *Compensatory Education; Educationally Disadvantaged; Inservice Education; *Kindergarten; *Language Skills; Parent Participation; Primary Education; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *Reading Readiness; Services; Teacher Aides
IDENTIFIERS Cleveland Public Schools OH

ABSTRACT

This report gives an interim evaluation for 1982-83 of the Kindergarten Reinforcement project in the Cleveland Public Schools. This project, designed to promote optimal development of disadvantaged children's basic learning skills relevant to subsequent successful school experiences, provides kindergarten teachers with supplementary instructional materials, differentiated inservice training, aides to provide reinforcement for "targeted" children, and support staff. The program emphasizes the improvement of cognitive functioning, especially in language acquisition, and active involvement on the part of parents. During the 1982-83 school year, project activities focused on the attainment of six specific objectives. The first objective, dealing with children's improvement on the Pre-reading Skills Composite Score on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests, was attained. Of the 264 students (in the total sample of 616) who scored below average on the fall pretest, 220 (83.3 percent) scored average or above average on the spring posttest. The other five objectives, pertaining to ongoing processes concerned with instruction, staff development, and parent-family involvement, were also attained. (CMG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED236289

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. Fleming
Cleveland Pub. Schools
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

KINDERGARTEN REINFORCEMENT

DISADVANTAGED PUPIL PROGRAM FUND

1982-1983
EVALUATION REPORT

Prepared by

Reba Garvey, Project Evaluator

Typed by

Cynthia D. Johnson

ID 023175

Cleveland Public Schools

DIVISION OF EVALUATION
DEPARTMENT OF RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

July, 1983

KINDERGARTEN REINFORCEMENT

1982-1983 DPPF Interim Evaluation

PURPOSE AND OVERVIEW

This project is designed to promote optimal development of disadvantaged children's basic learning skills relevant to successful subsequent school experiences, by providing the (general fund) kindergarten teachers with supplementary instructional materials, differentiated inservice, aides to provide reinforcement for "targeted" children, and supportive-staff assistance. Improvement of cognitive functioning--especially language facility--is emphasized. Active involvement of parents is promoted.

SERVICE SUMMARY

Pupils Served: 5,921 Grades Served: K Years in Operation: 16

Schools: 84 public (See Appendix A.)

Staffing:
- 1 Coordinator (Project Manager), FT
- 2 Instructional Specialists, FT
- 1 Reading Specialist, FT
- 1 Supportive Services Specialist, FT
- 2 Social Workers, FT
- 39 Educational Aides, FT
- 2 Clerks, FT
- 1 Laborer/Specialist, PT (50%)

Total DPPF Expenditures: _____* Per Pupil Cost: _____*

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Despite reductions in the numbers of educational aides available to assist in providing instructional reinforcement for "targeted" children and of supprotive services personnel, the project staff continues efforts to improve learning situations for disadvantaged kindergarten children in order to increase the likelihood of their success in subsequent school experiences. Project activities were focused on the attainment of six specific objectives during the 1982-1983 school year.

The first objective dealt with children's improvement on the Pre-reading Skills Composite Score on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests. Of the 264 pupils (in the total sample of 616) who scored "below average" on the fall pre-test, 220 (83.3%) scored "average" or "above average" on the spring post-test. This objective was clearly attained.

The other five objectives pertained to ongoing processed relevant to instruction, staff development and parent/family involvement. All five were attained, although one was completed a few weeks later than originally proposed and another in only one of several areas of development (language) listed in the objective.

OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES

A total of 5,912 children were enrolled in 193 kindergarten Reinforcement classes at 84 elementary schools. Thirty- nine educational aides were assigned to assist teachers in working with "targeted" pupils, i.e., those who demonstrated mastery of five or fewer (of 13) language skills and/or evidenced other special needs. Class sizes reported by teachers ranged from 18 to 45 children, with average size equaling 30.5 pupils. This, and other, information submitted by the teachers and project staff to the project manager and the evaluator was analyzed in relation to attainment of six project objectives for 1982-83.

- Objective 1: At least 50% of the pupils who scored below-average (stanines 1-3) on Metropolitan Readiness Tests, Level I, Pre-reading Skills Composite in October will score at least average (stanine 4 and above) on Metropolitan Readiness Tests, Level II, Pre-Reading Skills Composite administered citywide in May.

- Outcome: This objective was clearly attained.

  During October, all but six teachers pretested in each class a random sample of four children designated by the evaluator. A total of approximately 700 pupils completed the Metropolitan Readiness Test, Level I. MRT, Level II was administered city-wide to kindergarten pupils during the weeks of May 16 and 23, 1983 and results were obtained for 616 children who were part of the sample pretested.

  Of these 616, 264 (42.9%) scored in stanines 1-3 ("below average") on MRT, Level I in the fall of 1982. When the sample-children still enrolled were retested during the May, 1983 citywide administration of MRT, Level II, 220 (83.3%) of the "below average" group scored "average" (stanines 4-6) or "above average" (stanines 7-9). Thus, the objective was clearly attained.

  Looking at these data in a different way, one notes that the percentage of (616) pupils scoring in the "below average" range moved from 42.9% on the pre-test to only 8.0% on the post-test. The proportion of children with pre-reading composite scores in the "average" range was 49.7% on the pre-test and 56.3% on the post-test. Between pre-and post-testing, the percentage of pupils scoring "above average" moved from 7.5% to 35.7%.

  These MRT gains were confirmed by teacher-ratings of children's mastery of language skills. In the fall and spring, teachers submitted class lists indicating each child's mastery of Macmillan 2 language skills. (A sample form is included as Appendix B.) Both pre- and post-ratings were submitted for 601 children. In the fall, the median number (of 13) skills mastered was 3.6; in the spring, the median had increased to 12.4 skills mastered, corroborating the MRT results.

- Objective 2: Eighty-five percent (85%) of the teachers will maintain up-to-date records of the progress of the children in areas of psychomotor, social-emotional, verbal and numerical language, and other cognitive learnings.

- Outcome: Available data indicate that this objective was probably attained in the area of language skills.

Teachers were to forward to the evaluator immediately after the close of the first semester (January 28, 1983) completed surveys. (See Appendix C.) Responses to the seventh item were received from 88.8% of the (98) teachers.

- By making check marks, teachers rated their records of individual children's progress in each of the five areas, from "virtually nonexistent" through "fairly complete for about half" to "complete/up-to-date for all." (Numerical values from one [1] through nine [9] were arbitrarily assigned to check-mark locations by the evaluator. A value of 5 was assigned to the middle-rating, "fairly complete for about half.")

- Although more than 90% of the responding teachers (90.1% - 96.3%, in the various areas) marked "fairly complete for about half" or higher, only approximately one-third (28,4% - 38.3%) indicated that their records were "complete/up-to-date for all."

- Teachers' average (mean) ratings of the completeness of their records in the five areas (language development - verbal, language development-numerical, other cognitive areas, social - emotional development, psychomotor development) ranged from 6.6 to 6.8, slightly better than "fairly complete for about half."

Teachers were to submit to the project office November, 1982, two class evaluations, i.e., assessments of each child's mastery (or lack of mastery) of 13 language and 16 mathematics skills. (See Appendices B and D.) Updated assessments in language were called in late in May, 1983.

- These fall assessments served as the basis for teachers' maintaining up-to-date records of individual children's progress in verbal and numerical language--two of the proposed areas.

- At least 85% of the teachers submitted Macmillan Level 2 (language) assessments on a pre- (92.9%) and post- (85.7%) basis.

- Throughout the year, assessments of pupils' mastery of skills in the mathematics area were submitted by 81.6% of the teachers.

- Objective 3: Teacher consultants and Early Childhood Education administrative/supervisory staff will provide individualized inservice through at least two on-site visits/observations/conferences and through use of the Observation Checklist at least once with 90% of the teachers during the first semester, to facilitate sequential planning for children.

. Outcome: This objective was attained by March, 1983--approximately six weeks into the second semester.

At mid-year, information was collected from teacher consultants (on-site observation logs) and classroom teachers (survey--Items 4 and 5).

- For 63 (64.3%) of the 98 teachers, the above reports clearly indicated that this objective had been attained.

- For 6 (6.1%), the evidence clearly indicated non-attainment of the objective. (It should be noted, however, that one of these six teachers had just been assigned to the project.)

- The objective was probably attained for most of the other 29.6% of the teachers, but the documentation was incomplete.

By March, 1983 the project coordinator reported that the observation Checklist had been completed with all but five teachers thus bringing the attainment-level to approximately 95%

By June, 1983 the Checklist had been used at least once with every teacher, and the total number of teacher-consultant visits per classroom averaged well beyond the proposed two.

. Objective 4: Seventy-five percent (75%) of the staff participating in each inservice session will rate the workshop above average--i.e., 1 (Excellent) or 2 (Good) on a five-point scale.

. Outcome: Overall ratings of inservice sessions by participants who submitted completed reaction sheets indicated that this objective was attained.

At each inservice session each participant was given a reaction sheet (Appendix E) to complete and submit before leaving. For appraising the extent to which this objective was attained, the evaluator summarized participants' ratings of the "overall usefulness of session."

All project instructional staff (98 teachers and 39 aides) were involved in two of the inservice sessions. Only 60 (of the 119) participants in the September 8, 1982 orientation/organization meeting submitted an overall rating; 47 (78.3%) of these marked it "Excellent" or "Above Average" (Good). On January 28, 1983 the total staff focused on Reading Readiness; 80 (80.8%) of 99 participants who submitted an overall rating considered this session "Excellent" or "Above Average." Assuming that those who omitted the overall-rating item or neglected to submit a completed reaction sheet felt the same way, one can consider the objective attained for these two workshops.

This conclusion was corroborated by reaction sheets from smaller-group workshops, as shown in Table 1 (next page) for sessions focusing on assessment and the pilot program in mathematics readiness.

Table 1

KINDERGARTEN REINFORCEMENT: 1982-1983

PER CENT OF PARTICIPANTS RATING INSERVICE SESSIONS "EXCELLENT" OR "GOOD"

TOPIC/DATE(s)	ATTENDANCE	"EXCELLENT"/"GOOD" RATINGS	
		NUMBER	PER CENT
ASSESSMENT			
. Relating Assessment to Instruction:			
10/19/82	29 tchrs.	27/28	96.4%
10/20/82	27 tchrs.	24/24	100.0%
02/03/83 (make-up)	15 tchrs.	14/15	93.3%
. Assessment/Targeted Children:			
10/07/82	45 aides	41/42	97.6%
. Meeting Needs of Targeted Children: 03/09/83 or 03/10/83	41 aides	29/31	93.5%
MATHEMATICS PILOT PROGRAM			
. 09/08/82	21 tchrs. 15 aides	27/28	96.4%
. 12/01/82	21 tchrs.	19/19	100.0%
. 03/29/83 or 03/30/83	41 tchrs.	39/41	95.1%

[a] Number of respondents rating "overall usefulness of session" as "Excellent" or "Above Average" ("Good")/ number of participants responding to that item

- Objective 5: A parent (or adult family representative) of at least 75% of the project children will participate in at least one of the following: classroom visitation, conference with the child's teacher(s), classroom volunteer work, field trip, parent education workshop, advisory-group meeting.

  - Outcome: Attainment of this objective was documented.

    Mid-year documentation relevant to this objective was provided by the 81 (of 98) teachers who returned completed interim surveys. These data represented some or all project classes in 68 (of 84) schools. The analysis of responses summarized in Table 2 indicated that, by mid-year, parent participation was greatest in the area of conferences with the teacher at the school: approximately one-fifth of the responding teachers reported having involved at least 75% of their pupils' parents in this way.

Table 2

KINDERGARTEN REINFORCEMENT
FIRST SEMESTER, 1982-1983

PARENT PARTICIPATION REPORTED BY TEACHERS

SURVEY ITEM 3. For how many of your (total) pupils has a parent or other (adult) family representative...?	NUMBER AND PER CENT OF (98) TEACHERS REPORTING EACH LEVEL IN TERMS OF PUPILS ENROLLED 50.0 - 74.9%	75% OR MORE
. talked with you by telephone about the child	1.0%	4.1%
. talked with you at school about the child	32.7%	19.4%
. visited your classroom to observe child(ren) at work	20.4%	7.1%
. served as a volunteer helper in your classroom	2.0%	0.0%
. attended project Early Childhood meeting(s) at school or elsewhere	2.0%	1.0%

Additional documentation was requested in May, 1983. On the form teachers used to report post-test scores for pupils in the projectwide sample, they were asked to mark as follows beside each child's name,

0 - I've really had no contact with this family this year.

✓ - This child's parent/family representative has participated at least once this year in at least one of the following activities: classroom visitation/observation/volunteering; conference with me; attendance at parent-education meeting; field trip with pupils

\+ - I've "seen a lot of" this family this year.

At least one teacher from 77 (of 84) schools complied. For 502 (84.7%) of 592 children, teachers reported at least minimal (✓) parent involvement. More extensive involvement (+) was noted for 141 (23.8%) of the sample.

Further, detailed parent-participation data--by school and event--are on file in the project office. Teachers submitted information monthly (on the form included as Appendix F). Reports indicated that approximately 1,446 volunteers, mostly parents, assisted in project classrooms this year.

Objective 6: Social workers will provide continuity among home, school and community through observation, follow-up and--as needed--further referral for at least 85% of the children referred to them by kindergarten teachers.

Outcome: Data submitted by the Supportive Services Specialist indicate that this objective was attained.

During the period from September 7 through December 15, 1982, 261 project children were referred to the social workers; by December 15, 36 (13.8%) of theses cases were closed. By May 15, 1983 the total number served/referred had grown to 394, with 202 still pending. The Supportive Services Specialist's annual summary (9/7/82-6/15/83) showed an unduplicated total of 557 served/referred, with no cases carried over to the following year pending appropriate placement -- i.e., 91.7% closed.

- Social workers averaged more than 18 observations of children in classrooms and approximately four case conferences or team meetings per week.

- Furthermore, social workers frequently conferred with instructional and supportive staff about the children referred. During an "average" week, they discussed children's needs with: principals (13-14 times), teachers (60), health staff (8), speech therapists (6), psychologists (15-16), teachers consultants or other social workers (13).

- Social workers averaged 23 parent contacts per week: approximately 12 by telephone, 7 at school and 4 via home visit.

- By mid-June, social workers had made contact with 52 different agencies about project pupils. "Official" referrals were made in 23 instances.

Although this objective was met, Early Childhood program coordinators, central staff and classroom personnel are concerned about the growing number of problems faced by children and their families, exceeding the service-capacity of project supportive services. Social workers indicated that, of the more than thirteen hundred concerns reported, only about 72% could be dealt with. Proportionally most troublesome were finding time for ongoing efforts relevant to chronic absenteeism and **families in crisis.**

ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

Many salient features of Kindergarten Reinforcement operations are not revealed in discussion of the specific objectives in isolation. Some of these are noted below.

Other Program Features

- Staff development was highly differentiated, on an ongoing basis, providing extensive support to classroom personnel in implementation of appropriate instruction.

  - Teacher consultants provided totally individualized, on-site inservice for instructional staff. (See Objective 3.)

  - The Reading Specialist, also, provided on-site inservice for classroom teachers, in addition to providing each biannually with SPARKS (a newsletter of Supplementary Prereading Activities to Reinforce Kindergarten Skills correlated with the Macmillan 2 language assessment used by teachers, shown in Appendix B).

  - As appropriate teacher consultants arranged for groups of three teachers to spend a day in another project classroom for structured observation and discussion. These mini-workshops focused on programming of learning centers in relation to children's assessed needs, classroom management techniques and effective transitional activities.

  - Specialized supportive services personnel assigned to the project met not only with each other--in relation to Kindergarten Reinforcement operations and children's needs--but also with system-wide and area professionals in the same specialty.

- Project "central staff" participated in professional meetings to the extent that the calendar and budget permitted and, subsequently, shared with total staff.

. Classroom staff had extensive assistance from the very limited number of supportive services personnel assigned to the project, supplementing services available through the regular school staffs. Teachers' utilization of supportive services was suggested by their responses to the sixth item on the mid-year survey (Appendix C).

- All 79 teachers responding to this item indicated that they had conferred on at least one occasion with at least one (type of) supportive services personnel--speech therapist, psychologist, nurse, social worker.

- Most frequently indicated were the project social workers and the regular (i.e., general fund) school nurses. Approximately 70% mentioned conferring with the (regular school) psychologist and 29% with the speech therapist(s).

- The project speech therapist averaged ten speech/hearing screenings or diagnostic testings per week. She worked with Kindergarten Reinforcement and other project, as well as school, staffs and parents throughout the year. Diagnostic/therapy classroom sessions were provided on about fifty occasions.

. Teacher Consultants and the project coordinator spent considerable time with classroom teachers not only on improving the learning environment and instructional techniques but also on developing/implementing strategies for coping with and meeting the often-overwhelming "nonacademic" needs of the children. They spent a great deal of their time in project classrooms working with individual pupils, to help provide for the special needs evidenced by "targeted" children. Reports on file with the project manager document the extent of their efforts. Too varied to detail, these might be categorized as:

- observation/assessment relevant to learning-related problems (visual, auditory, motor, cognitive, etc.) or talents (artistic, intellectual, etc.), especially in response to teachers' monthly reports of concerns about individual children;

- conferences with project and regular school staff, parents, specialists et al. about the child's current instructional plan and its implementation, as well as his/her next placement (regular first grade, Major Work, learning disabled class, etc.).

They occasionally "covered" a class so that a teacher could participate in a (team) meeting or (parent) conference; they assisted some teachers with Macmillan Level 2 (language) assessment in the fall and others with administration of the Metropolitan Readiness Tests, Level II, in the spring.

- Learning experiences for Kindergarten Reinforcement children were enhanced through cooperative endeavors undertaken with not only regular school staff but also personnel of other special programs in school and community.

  - Kindergarten Reinforcement staff continued to work closely with other Early Childhood programs, e.g., Child Development and PAP (Pupil Adjustment Project) funded by Chapter 1. In addition to close cooperation among "central staff" of these projects and shared staff development, as appropriate, contacts were maintained at the building level.

    -- Of 22 Kindergarten Reinforcement teachers who indicated on the interim survey that they had children receiving supplementary service at a PAP Adjustment Center, 19 (86.4%) noted conferring with the PAP teacher on at least one occasion--usually more frequently.

    -- On March 9 and 10, 1983 PAP teachers participated in on-site inservice through structured observation/discussion in a kindergarten classroom.

  - Ongoing cooperation with the Office of Bilingual Education made it possible to provide effective learning situations for children whose primary language is not English. Bilingual services are detailed below.

  - Project staff drew upon the expertise of the mathematics supervisor in at least two major undertakings.

    -- Teachers involved in piloting a mathematics program for kindergarten children were involved in special inservice sessions.

    -- Fifteen project staff interested in computer literacy participated in a special session on October 14 and a series of five, weekly, three-hour workshops (November-December).

  - The assistance of a wide variety of community resources/agencies was utilized in a number of ways. A few examples are mentioned.

    -- Cleveland Public Library, Cleveland Health Education Museum, Cuyahoga County Cooperative Extension Service, Federation for Community Planning--parent workshops/materials

    -- Cleveland State University--specialized staff development

    -- Cuyahoga County Welfare Department, Cleveland State University Speech Clinic, Kenneth W. Clement Health Center--child referral

. Instructional and supportive staff promoted parent participation in a variety of ways, including articles in THE BRIDGE (newsletter for early childhood parents, published/distributed three/four times a year).

- Parents were encouraged to visit their child(ren)'s classroom(s) to observe and, if at all possible, volunteer.

- Parents provided input for project operations, especially on such occasions as the annual, citywide parent program planning meeting (November 10, 1982).

- Kindergarten Reinforcement parents participated in the Chapter 1 District Advisory Council.

Bilingual Services

Attainment of several project objectives was at least partially contingent upon special activities conducted in coopeation with the Office of Bilingual Education. These activities involved staff, as well as pupils and parents whose first language is not English. From the Kindergarten Reinforcement project coordinator's report on bilingual services, the following highlights were extracted.

. A total of 70 Early Childhood children (Kindergarten Reinforcement, ECIA Chapter 1 Child Development) were screened for Lau-service eligibility.

. Bilingual services were provided for Early Childhood pupils at 13 schools. Nine of these were designated Lau Kindergarten sites--providing Spanish and, in some, Arabic, Romanian, Vietnamese and/or Korean, also.

. Early Childhood teachers and aides working in bilingual settings received inservice training on four occasions (9/9/82, 10/7/82, 10/27/82, 3/9 - 10/83), in addition to ongoing, on-site assistance from the project coordinator and teacher consultants.

. Early Childhood personnel provided inservice training for ESL (English As a Second Language) and CAIR (Cleveland Arabic, Indonesian, and Romanian Elementary Bilingual Education Program) staffs, to acquaint them with the Early Childhood program philosophy, goals and curriculum.

. Parent materials were prepared in languages other than English.

- Springboards for Early Learning (pamphlet of suggestions for parents to use at home in promoting their young children's cognitive development) was produced in Spanish, Korean and Chinese, as well as English.

- Progress Reports (report cards) were translated into Arabic, Romanian, Spanish and Vietnamese.

Exploratory Statistical Analyses

Several exploratory studies have been designed to assist project staff in providing information beyond that directly related to attainment of the proposed objectives. Some have been implemented to assess--at least statistically--the effects of selected variables (such as class size).

Prior to the opening of the 1983-1984 school year, the evaluator will complete these analyses and report to the project coordinator findings on topics such as the following.

- Lau Kindergarten and Comparison-group Results
- Pupil-background Data and Pre-test/rating Results
- Pre-post Data on Quantitative Development
- Relationships of Descriptive Variables and Post-measures "Adjusted" for Pre-measures

APPENDIX A

CLEVELAND CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT

ADAPTATION OF CURRICULUM, INSTRUCTIONAL METHOD AND MATERIALS:

KINDERGARTEN REINFORCEMENT

LIST OF SCHOOLS 1982-1983

Adlai Stevenson
Alfred A. Benesch
Almira
Andrew J. Rickoff
Anthony Wayne

Anton Grdina
Artemus Ward
Benjamin Franklin
Bolton
Brooklawn

Buckeye-Woodland
Buhrer
Captain Arthur Roth
Case
Charles Dickens

Charles H. Lake
Charles Orr
Chesterfield
Clark
Corlett

Cranwood
Daniel E. Morgan
Denison
Dike
Douglas MacArthur

East Clark
East Madison
Emile B. deSauze
Euclid Park
Forest Hill Parkway

Fullerton
Garfield
George Washington Carver
Giddings
Gordon

Gracemount
Halle
Harvey Rice
Hazeldell
Henry W. Longfellow

Iowa-Maple
John W. Raper
Joseph F. Landis
Kenneth W. Clement
Kentucky

Louis Agassiz
Louis Pasteur
Margaret A. Ireland
Marion C. Seltzer
Marion-Sterling

Mary B. Martin
Mary McLeod Bethune
McKinley
Memphis
Miles

Miles Park
Miles Standish
Milford
Mound
Mount Auburn

Mount Pleasant
Nathaniel Hawthorne
Oliver Hazard Perry
Orchard
Paul Laurence Dunbar

Paul Revere
Riverside
Robert Fulton
Robinson G. Jones
Scranton

Stephen E. Howe
Tremont
Union
Valley View
Verda Brobst

Wade Park
Walton
Warner
Watterson-Lake
Waverly

William Cullen Bryant
William Rainey Harper
Willow
Woodland Hills

APPENDIX B

CLASS EVALUATION RECORD

LEVEL 2

School _____ Room _____

Teacher _____ ☐ A.M. ☐ P.M.

Record as follows:

☐ assessed (left to right)

☒ assessed and mastered

(The diagonal line indicating mastery should be black for pretest, red for post test.

NAME	1. Using basic sentence transformations	2. Using parts of speech	3. Telling story with beginning, middle, and end	4. Relating picture of concept to its opposite	5. Describing cause and effect	6. Distinguishing between letter, word, and sentence	7. Printing name	8. Printing letters Aa-Zz	9. Naming two classifications for an object	10. Completing oral statement with spoken word	11. Matching words	12. Recognizing objects that have same beginning sound	13. Recognizing words that rhyme
1.													
2.													
3.													
4.													
5.													
6.													
7.													
8.													
9.													
10.													
11.													
12.													
13.													
14.													
15.													
16.													
17.													
18.													
19.													
20.													

APPENDIX C

KINDERGARTEN REINFORCEMENT TEACHERS: INTERIM EVALUATION SURVEY — JANUARY, 1983

URGENT! COMPLETE AT ONCE! RETURN VIA TODAY'S SCHOOL MAIL!

1. ENROLLMENT ON FRIDAY, JANUARY 28, 1983
(Record numbers of pupils in chart at right.)

CLASS	TO-DATE	AT-DATE
A.M.		
P.M.		
TOTAL		

2. How many of your pupils are served at a PAP Adjustment Center? _____

3. For how many of your (total) pupils has a parent or other (adult) family representative:

- talked with you by telephone about the child? _____
- talked with you at school about the child? _____
- visited your classroom to observe child(ren) at work? _____
- served as a volunteer helper in your classroom? _____
- attended project/Early Childhood meeting(s) at school or elsewhere? _____

4. How many times during the first semester was your classroom visited by:

- your "assigned" teacher consultant? _____
- other teacher consultant? _____
- speech therapist? _____
- project manager? _____
- social worker? _____
- reading specialist? _____

5. On how many of these occasions did the visitor:

discuss (and leave) with you the completed Observation Checklist? _____

refer to checklist, make recommendations and set goals? _____

talk with you about specific children, materials, procedures, etc.? _____

6. How many times during the first semester did you confer about a child with:

- Child Development teacher? _____
- PAP Adjustment Center teacher? _____
- Early Childhood reading specialist? _____
- project speech therapist? _____
- project social worker? _____
- school principal? _____
- school psychologist? _____
- school nurse? _____

7. How do you rate your records of individual children's progress in each area? (Check in one "box" along the line to the right of each of the five areas.)

AREA	VIRTUALLY NON-EXISTENT ▷ ▷ ▷ ▷		FAIRLY COMPLETE FOR ABOUT HALF ▷ ▷		COMPLETE/ UP-TO-DATE FOR ALL ▷
Language Development - Verbal					
Language Development - Numerical					
Other Cognitive Areas					
Social-Emotional Development					
Psychomotor Development					

8. How many half-days per weeks do you have an aide? (maximum = 10) _____

How many weeks of the first semester did you have an aide? (maximum = 19) _____

9. What's "going best" with your kindergarten? _____

DATE _____ SCHOOL _____ TEACHER _____

APPENDIX D

MATH EVALUATION

SCHOOL _____ ROOM _____

TEACHER _____ ☐ A.M. ☐ P.M.

This should be done in ABC order - boys and girls mixed

RECORD AS FOLLOWS: ☒

NAME	1. Classification: . diameter . shape (circle, triangle, square, rectangle)	2. Patterning Top/bottom	3. One-to-One Correspondence	4. Conservation of Number More/Fewer	5. Seriates: (ordering)	6. Counts Objects 1 - 30	7. Quantitative Concepts to Ten	8. Identify Numerals to Ten	9. Match Set to Numerals	10. Sequencing Sets and Numerals	11. Join Sets and tell how many there are in all	12. Ordinals (1st - 5th) Before/After

APPENDIX E

CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Reaction Sheet

Child Development ☐
Pupil Adjustment ☐
Kdg. Reinforcement ☐

Meeting Site:_____
Title of Meeting:_____
Date:_____

Home School_____
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Division of Compensatory Education

(A) Please supply the information requested in the spaces below by entering the appropriate codes found on the reverse side of this form.

Participant Code__ __ Cluster Code__ __

Race Code__ __

(B) To the right of each characteristic listed below, mark one box under the heading which most accurately indicates you impression of this session.

Characteristic	Excellent	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Poor	Not Applicable
Clarity of purpose	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Method of presentation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Clarity of content	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Usefulness of ideas	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Usefulness of materials	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Opportunity for interaction	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Effectiveness of discussion	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quantity of new knowledge/ skills acquired	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adequacy of time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Overall usefulness of session	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

(C) Comments/Suggestions:_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX F

MONTHLY REPORT FOR PARENT PARTICIPATION

CLEVELAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS
DIVISION OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

MONTHLY REPORT From 1/16 to 1/15

SCHOOL _____ TEACHER _____ ROOM _____

Name of Parents/Volunteers	Parent	Grandparent	Other	Number of times Volunteered		Visitation and Parent Meeting	Special parent meeting	Number of Conferences		
				Classroom	Field Trip			School	Phone	Home
1.										
2.										
3.										
4.										
5.										
6.										
7.										
8.										
9.										
10.										
11.										
12.										
13.										
14.										
15.										
16.										
17.										
Total (over)				20						